DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 011 CS 508 522

AUTHOR Crawford, C. B.
TITLE Argument for the Requirement of Judging Philosophies at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament.
PUB DATE Nov 93
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (79th, Miami Beach, FL, November 18-21, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Debate; *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Judges; Public Speaking; *Student Evaluation; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS Communication Context; Debate Tournaments; *Judge Philosophy Statements; *Pi Kappa Delta

ABSTRACT

Noting that the use and utility of judging philosophy statements have long been a contested issue in intercollegiate debate, this paper examines the rationale for using philosophy statements, discusses the effectiveness of philosophy statements, and advocates the use of such statements at Pi Kappa Delta's National Tournament. The paper notes that research on the rationale for using philosophy statements concluded that three basic benefits result from philosophy statements: better audience analysis, formalization of judge's positions, and more effective coaching. Research on the effectiveness of philosophy statements have been inconclusive, but the paper argues that use of philosophy statements may be the best method of gaining insight into a critic's behavior at the Pi Delta Kappa National Tournament, but that the use of the judging philosophy statement at every tournament would render the tool ineffective. The paper reasons that to make the technique more effective several changes on the statement should be considered. The paper draws specific conclusions about the use of judging philosophy statements at the National Tournament. Contains 13 references. (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 011

Argument for the Requirement of Judging Philosophies at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament

C. B. Crawford

Department of Communication

Fort Hays State University

A Paper Presented at the 1993 Speech Communication Association Convention, Miami, FL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.B. Crawford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS508522

Running Head: Philosophies at PKD Nationals

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The use and utility of judging philosophy statements have long been a contested issue in intercollegiate debate. The purpose of this paper was to examine the rationale for using philosophy statements, the effectiveness of philosophy statements, and finally, to advocate the use of philosophy statements at the National Tournament. Initially, research on the rationale for using philosophy statements concluded that three basic benefits result from philosophy statements: better audience analysis, formalization of judge's positions, and more effective coaching. Research on the effectiveness of the philosophy statements have been inconclusive, but the use of the philosophy statements may be the best method of gaining insight into a critic's behavior at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament. The use of the judging philosophy statement at every tournament would render the tool ineffective. The author reasoned that to make the technique more effective several changes on the statement should be changed. Specific conclusions about the use of judging philosophy statements at the National Tournament were drawn.

Argument for the Requirement of Judging Philosophies at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament

The integration of judging philosophy sheets into tournament competition has been a point of contention from its inception. To some members of the debate community the judging philosophy sheet represents a movement toward more specialization of the judging pool. Members adhering to another perspective seem to offer compelling argument about the benefits from requiring judging philosophies specifically allowing for audience adaptation. Yet other members of the debate community feel that the judging philosophy statements are not used appropriately, but could have specific value with revision. Regardless of the perspective one might adopt, the judging philosophy is truly an artifact of the debate community that divides rather than unifies, its departure will not be rapid or painless.

It is not the purpose of this author to offer a specific critique of the extreme poles. Rather this paper seeks to offer a solution that attempts to address the major counterarguments posed against each opposing positions. This paper further offers a position that seeks to maximize the benefits of judging philosophy statements without causing an early death for CEDA

division debate at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament. It is this author's intention to advocate a judging philosophy that is effective, efficient, consistent, and a means by which judges can articulate their preferences.

Definition and Description of Philosophy Statements

As it has been operationalized, the judging philosophy sheet is a document listing a series of questions or issues for the potential judge to answer or describe their position. The judging philosophy sheet has been used since at least the early 1970s in the NDT division, and its integration into CEDA has been most marked at the National Tournament. Traditional issues that have been listed on the call for judging philosophy statements have centered around issues of delivery, standards of proof, procedural issues, common paradigm, and substantive issues of the topic. In addition, the form has commonly asked for name, institution, position, years of judging, and rounds heard on the topic. Commonly people completing the judging philosophy can articulate their answer in one or two pages. The judging philosophy sheet, while seemingly non-intrusive, does seem to ask a critic to respond very pointedly about their attitudes dealing with specific issues like tag-team debate, full citations, and reading evidence

after the round. A completed judging philosophy sheet can communicate a wealth of information.

The judging philosophy form, once completed by the potential judge, is returned to the individual tournament director. The forms have been disseminated to participants in two different ways. First, and most common, tournament directors post the philosophy statements on a wall or other conspicuous place where participants have open access to them. The second alternative, also a more costly and labor intensive method, is compiling the judging philosophy statements into a collection that is duplicated for the participants. Regardless of the method, each method allows for relatively open and free access to the statements for the debaters and coaches.

Justifications for Utilizing Judging Philosophies

Judging philosophy statements have been used for many years and several lines of justification have emerged supporting their use. Justifications for the use of judging philosophy statements center around the unique educational tool it provides both debater and coach. Three related justifications emerged from a review of the existing literature. First, judging philosophy statements have been advocated as a tool for facilitating audience analysis. Second, the use of the judging

philosophy statements have been justified as a means of formalizing a judge's stance on issues. Third, the use of judging philosophies have been favored as a technique to improve coaching.

Audience analysis. The central purpose of the judging philosophy has historically been based on audience analysis. Gill (1988) reasoned that debaters must adapt to their audience. Gill's analysis was based on existing literature in the fields of debate and public speaking. Gill (1988) further extended the rationale for understanding audience sentiment suggesting that often debaters misanalyze the audience they speak to. Perhaps Cirlin (1986) stated the position best "There is nothing wrong with debaters who can speak like a machine gun, think like a computer, and cite evidence like a Supreme Court Justice, as long as they can also turn into a Daniel Webster when the occasion demands" (p. 89).

The problems of audience analysis become more compounded when judges from many regions participate because the norms in one region may be radically different than other regions. Gill (1988) further argued that audience analysis was needed because of the broad diversity among judges. Other members of the debate community (Miller, 1988) cautioned us that little if any agreement exists on a paradigm for debates. Miller

(1988) further suggested that paradigms overlap substantially resulting in even fewer judges that render decisions based exclusively on the rigor of a paradigm. This lack of agreement about the most appropriate paradigm and the lack of adherence to any paradigm suggests that audience analysis is even more important.

Gotcher and Greene (1988) took issue with the notion that audience adaptation is generally a positive outcome. These authors suggested that audience analysis promotes audience intervention and alters the terministic screen of the debaters. While it is not within the purview of this paper to argue for such a fatalistic outcome, it does seem necessary to respond to the criticism of the ability for debaters to adapt. In a perfect world (or tournament) there may be so little variance in the judging pool that analysis would be unnecessary. But in the real world where competing paradigms (and judges interpretations of the paradigm) seem to be commonplace, and the judging pool is very heterogeneous, audience adaptation is not only necessary, but vital. Denial of the need for audience analysis does not take away all of the intervention that ever existed, nor does it improve a judge or debater. Gotcher and Greene (1988) contended "When the critic imposes a posture on the debate round, the judge's role is transformed from an evaluator of

argument to an active participant in the creation, refutation, and even presentation of arguments" (1988, p. 90). Surely one must question whether a judge ever be just a noninterpreting recorder. The obvious answer is a resounding "NO". Hunt (1993) contended,

> The pretense of objective arbitrator precludes the tabula rosa judge from standing up like a woman or man and imposing good argumentation theory upon debates for the good of the debaters as students and for the good of the quality of the activity. Teachers must intervene. Ethically and morally they can't really teach if they do not. Debate judges must become more interventionist and be teachers.

The critic must evaluate and interpret the round in order to perform their essential role - a decision. Denial of audience analysis leads all essential parties to enforce their potentially divergent terministic screens on the round when in reality performing an audience analysis may bring them to a more intersubjective state. In sum, Gotcher and Greene really do not seem to create a well reasoned argument against audience analysis, only against excessive judge intervention.

Gill (1988) offered a specific solution to the need for audience analysis - the judging philosophy. Seemingly, judging philosophies allow debaters the

opportunity to alter their persuasive strategy depending on the judging philosophy of the critic. Many authors have defended the use of judging philosophy sheets (Alspach, 1991; Bartanen, 1991; Gill, 1988; Henderson & Boman, 1983; Hunt, 1993). In fact, Henderson and Boman (1983) unequivocally concluded "Since debate judges do follow the direction they identify in their philosophies, debaters can use philosophies as adaptation aids with confidence" (p. 197).

Formalization of philosophy. In their empirical work extending the validity of judging philosophies Henderson and Boman (1983) found that the judging philosophy statement performs the function of a public commitment by the critic. It is a social contract at some level. The publicness of the philosophy statement plays a role in validating the link between the philosophy statement and later ballot activity. One of the important qualities of any critic is to declare a philosophy by which they will consistently adjudicate a debate round. Essentially, the publicness forces a critic to behave consistent with the philosophy statement. Public commitment, according to Henderson and Boman makes the declaration even more perceptually binding. Bartanen (1991) further articulated the importance of the public declaration suggesting that

"Having critics articulate their judging frameworks could emphasize the importance of their role as educators" (p. 4). Seemingly, a convincing philosophy publically stated further helps to create clearer standards for evaluating debates, a task consistent with Bartanen's analysis. The role of the judging philosophy statement in assisting a judge in the public declaration of a philosophy is substantial.

Coaching. Henderson and Boman (1983) forwarded the rationale for using judging philosophy sheets as a tool for coaching. Without question, one of the major (although implicit) reasons for the prior dissemination of the judging philosophy statements to the participants at a national tournament is to assist the debate coach in advising strategies for adaptation to the individual critic. Coaching is generally dedicated to preparing debaters to respond strategically to judges they have not debated in front of before. Henderson and Boman argued "...debate coaches can use philosophies with confidence to instruct debaters....The conscientious debate coach would be ill advised not to consider using debate judging philosophies as a pedagogical tool" (p. 197-8). In sum, if the ability of the coach to prepare the debater is increased, then it seems logical that the adaptation to the individual critic should be better as well.

Taken together, the use of judging philosophy statements can assist debaters in adapting to their audience, it can assist judges in formalizing a philosophy to judge from, and their use can assist coaches in preparing debates teams for competition. In order to fully understand the role of judging philosophy statements the practical validity of the philosophy statements must be explored.

Effectiveness of Judging Philosophy Forms

Several authors have supported the use of judging philosophy forms for a variety of reasons. Alspach (1991), Bartanen (1991) and Gill (1988) proposed that there was some basic efficacy in utilizing judging philosophies. However, these specific findings are anecdotal and based more on convention than empirical proof. Henderson and Boman (1983) supported the judging philosophy based on their empirical analysis of twenty-six judges in the NDT division of debate. The results of their analysis suggested that most judges have above seventy percent consistency (only 6 judges fell below this level). They contended that "On the basis of these results, debate judges can be expected to be consistent in ballot and philosophy statements" (Henderson & Boman; 1983; p. 197).

In other research Dudczak and Day (1991a) argued

that there was little connection between judging philosophy statements and balloting decisions. Critics deviate from their philosophical statement to reflect common conventions of the community (Dudczak & Day, 1991a). An unidentified methodological weakness of the Dudczak and Day (1991a) analysis may be the root of the nonsignificant findings. These researchers studied only the results of a self-report devised by the authors and coded judging philosophy statements in comparison with comments written on the ballot. Dudczak and Day (1991a) also contended that there is a general mistrust of self-report instruments. Furthermore, while these comments reflect the cognitive processes critics engage in, the written comments are really quite limited and would be prone to be less elaborated. Furthermore, the analysis performed between the judging philosophy and the actual ballot behavior is not clearly reported; it was coded first in terms of perceived paradigm then consistencies between paradigm and later ballot activity was examined. This coding scheme further confounds the findings since Dudczak and Day (1991a) admit that there were no distinct boundaries associated with CEDA paradigms. In a summary of their research program Dudczak and Day (1991b) concluded that "evidence reported by Dudczak & Day's regional pilot study indicates that

judges philosophy statements have higher predictive power than do survey questionnaires" (p. 8). While this study does put some doubt on the validity of the judging philosophy as a tool of audience adaptation, there is to date no better method of allowing a judge to represent their attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and values than the judging philosophy statements.

Several publications in the field show support for the practicality of judging philosophy statements. The two empirical studies addressing the link between the philosophy statements provide mixed support for the statements. In sum, while there may be differences in the validity in the use of the philosophy, there is still much anecdotal support for their use. Presumably, those people analyzing their use seem convinced that despite their shortcomings the use of judging philosophy statements is warranted. In light of these findings, there is a compelling need to integrate these statements (perhaps in a more valid form) into the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament.

Use of Judging Philosophies at the National Tournament

The solution to the need for judging philosophies at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament is simple. Bartanen (1991) argued that the use of formal judging philosophy statements should be integrated into the Pi

Kappa Delta National Tournament. The use of judging philosophies at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament would be consistent with both the CEDA National Tournament and the NDT Tournament. Judging philosophy statements should be solicited to participating chapters prior to the tournament or upon entry of the chapter. The philosophy statements could then be prepared and ready for distribution at the National Tournament.

The rationale for integrating judging philosophy statements into the National Tournament centers around the three benefits that have been outlined previously. First, using judging philosophy statements will assist student debaters in adapting to the specific tastes of their critics. At any National Tournament there will be tremendous diversity of experience and normative expectation of critics. The judging philosophy statement represents one method of assisting students adapt to their audience better. Second, the use of judging philosophy statements at Pi Kappa Delta Nationals would assist judges in formalizing philosophies. Critics skilled in evaluating debates would likely have the ability to articulate their philosophy. Those critics with less experience would need to dedicate more thought to preparing a philosophy statement. In the end debaters learn and critics can learn as well. The final benefit

from using the judging philosophy statements involves the improved coaching that can occur. Judging philosophies can not only allow students to self-direct their own debate destiny, but philosophy statements can assist coaches in helping students find more appropriate arguments and better delivery methods for the critic. Few people can dispute that students could not improve by some degree of coaching. Regardless of the degree the coach feels comfortable with, the philosophy statements offer an avenue for the coach to become involved.

Why Not Every Tournament?

Logically, if the judging philosophy works well at the National Tournament, why not integrate the philosophy into every tournament experience? Several lines of rationale seem to suggest that requiring the philosophy statement at every tournament might be counterproductive. First, if the judging philosophy statements are required at every tournament there would be an increased likelihood that they would become a trivial activity. The research that has been done on the effectiveness of the judging philosophy statements has centered around their use at national level tournaments. The tendency for judges to write a philosophy statement early in a season then become lax in revising that statement would be overwhelming. Rewriting the philosophy statements

would become "a collosal waste of time" for already busy judges, even though the effectiveness of using philosophy statements rests on the importance of that act.

Second, the National Tournament, by its very nature, is always going to be out of region for some debate teams. Other tournaments that debate squads travel to would likely be in their region. The added utility of having judging philosophies for in-region judges seems very small since a coach is likely to know the critic's judging philosophy anyway. The National Tournament is quite different though. The probability that a coach would know the philosophies of all or even many of the judges is very slim. The decision to have philosophies at the National Tournament seems more sound since coaches probably already know their in-region judges.

Third, Pi Kappa Delta has much more power to influence the National Tournament. The provincial and individual chapter tournaments would not need the statements of philosophy because they are much more regional. There seems to be little justification for Pi Kappa Delta to regulate an already sanctioned tournament. Furthermore, since the regional judging pool is more likely to be known it seems likely that the use of philosophies at province tournaments would be less necessary. Thus, three separate lines of reason seem to

point to one solution that overcomes the detriment of inclusion at all tournaments and the lack of the philosophy statement. The judging philosophy statement should be utilized at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament in some form.

A Minor Repair?

Much of the critical commentary on judging philosophies centers around the inadequacy of the questions on the philosophy form. Dudczak and Day (1991a, 1991b) questioned the validity of self-report of judging paradigm. Dudczak and Day (1991a, 1991b) further implied that the determination of paradigm is little more than chance since few distinctive elements discriminate the various paradigms at work in CEDA debate. This evidence seems even more compelling in light of recent writings on paradigm transience. According to Crawford (1993) critics have the ability to shift decision making lenses at leisure. The evidence suggests that the philosophy statements, while they are not wholly reflective of the actual occurrence, still may be the best method of gaining insight into a judge's decision calculus. If, in fact, the philosophy statements are the most effective method, but still lack basic information, then revision of their form may produce added benefits.

Possible revision in the judging philosophy

statements should address the inadequacy of centering primarily on the paradigm. On many judging philosophy forms the indication of paradigm commonly used is one of the first questions. Since paradigms are rather "porous and unreliable" in their interpretation and application, their predictive value is lessened (Dudczak & Day, 1989, p. 24). Dudczak and Day (1990) argued that "while paradigms exist conceptually, they don't necessarily possess distinctive boundaries. Judges employ the label for a paradigm, but aren't obligated to adhere to any standard definition or use convention" (p. 24). Paradigm isolation, according to Dudczak and Day is artificial due to the lack of distinctiveness between individual paradigms. The reliance on tabula rosa as the dominant judging paradigm has allowed critics to vacillate widely within a given paradigm from round to round (Crawford, 1993). Dudczak and Day (1990) also reminded that even if paradigms existed that would not necessarily insure that critics understood them enough to be effective. Future philosophy statements should not emphasize the paradigm, but rather emphasize common debate conventions, norms, and expectations.

Relatedly, the philosophy forms should encourage elaboration rather than succinctness. If short statements of philosophy become the norm then students

will be surprised and disappointed when they find out that they were the exception to an abbreviated judge's philosophy statement. Elaboration would also allow the critic to develop more of the rationale and the extenuating situational circumstances that always enter into debate rounds. Obviously, the philosophy statements may well become voluminous, but many would rather have more information rather than not enough information.

Another change for the judging philosophy should focus on the issues placed on debate ballots. Very little importance in academic debate is placed on the issues that have been developed and placed on ballots to judge debates by. Changes in this area could include allowing judges more opportunity to specify their criteria for effective analysis or cross-examination skills. Some critics could contend that they do not rigidly adhere to the criteria on the ballot, but in fact they must take many of those issues into account when deciding the round.

Additionally, the judging philosophy form must be written to reflect the issues that are important to students and coaches both. Too often the tournament director simply asks for written comments on debate theory where there may be little variance in position anyway. Presumably, students should be better able to

identify those issues that are important to them. One of the important criticisms of the judging philosophy statement is based on students that do not adapt to critics even though they have a statement of philosophy. Allowing students input in the process could help alleviate this problem two ways. First, student participation at this level would send a signal that coaches value students input, thus serving as an olive branch of sorts. Second, the inclusion of questions that students want answered would give debaters information that they may have needed all along to adapt. Future judging philosophy statements in Pi Kappa Delta must allow students' input. If coaches are dedicated to teaching the role of adaptation in the art of persuasion they must listen to students' perspectives about the content of the judging philosophy statements.

Conclusion

Judging philosophy sheets have been widely and successfully used in debate. The use of philosophy sheets produces more audience adaptation, more consistency, and better coaching. Recently the use of the judging philosophies have come under fire from research that suggests that people do not adhere to their philosophy statements. It is this author's position that while the philosophy statements are not perfect they are

the best method of attaining the advantages of adaptation, judging consistency, and better coaching. The use of the philosophy at all tournaments will tend to decrease the effectiveness of the statements, but their use at the National Tournament will produce adaptation and better debating. Further, if there are problems with the use of the judging philosophy statements then Pi Kappa Delta ought to take a leading role in changing and adapting a more appropriate philosophy statement for the National Tournament.

As Pi Kappa Delta enters the 21st century, changes must be made to match the activity to the needs and desires of all the participants (coach, student, and alumni). The integration of effective tools like the judging philosophy statement at the National Tournament will help Pi Kappa Delta adapt and force changes in the world of debate. By being proactive in dealing with far reaching changes Pi Kappa Delta will remain a vital force in the debate and individual events community.

References

Alspach, S.L. (1991). The debate ballot: Sword or plowshare. Paper presented at the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference, West Long Branch, NJ.

Bartanen, K.M. (1991). Judge as educator-critic: A guiding metaphor. Paper presented at the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference, West Long Branch, NJ.

Cirlin, A. (1986). Judging, evaluation, and the quality of CEDA debate. National Forensic Journal, 4, 81-90.

Crawford, C.B. (1993). "Now you see it, now you don't" - The case of transient decision making paradigms. Paper presented at the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference, Tacoma, WA.

Dudczak, C.A. & Day, D. (1989). A taxonomy of CEDA debate critics. Paper presented at the Speech communication Association Convention, San Francisco, CA.

Dudczak, C.A. & Day, D. (1990). The impact of paradigm consistency on taxonomic boundaries in CEDA debate. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

Dudczak, C.A. & Day, D. (1991a). The impact of paradigm consistency on taxonomic boundaries in CEDA debate. CEDA Yearbook, 12, 27-47.

Dudczak, C.A. & Day, D. (1991b). Debate philosophy statements as predictors of critic attitudes: A summary and direction of research. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Atlanta, GA.

Gill, M. (1988). Knowing the judge: The key to successful debate. CEDA Yearbook, 9, 96-101.

Gotcher, J.M. & Greene, R.W. (1988). The role of the critic and the audience-centered model of debate problems and possibilities. CEDA Yearbook, 9, 85-99.

Henderson, B. & Boman, D.L. (1983). A study to determine if judges' judging philosophy statements are consistent with their later related ballot statements. Journal of the American Forensic Association, 19, 191-198.

Hunt, S. (1993). Forensic roundtable position paper. Paper presented at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament, Tacoma, WA.

Miller, G.R. (1988). The forensics critic as an "Ideologue-critic": An argument for ideology as a new paradigm for academic debate. CEDA Yearbook, 9, 71-80.